REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-21 and 23-39 stand rejected in the outstanding Official Action. Claims 1 and 20 have been amended and therefore claims 1, 2, 4-21 and 23-39 remain in this application.

This application is an RCE filed after receipt of the Decision of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences mailed on March 31, 2009. While the Board agreed with the Examiner's broad claim term construction, the Board did not agree with the Examiner's assertions as to what was disclosed in the cited prior art references. Specifically, the Board defined "condition" as being virtually anything taught by the prior art references (see Decision pages 7 and 8) and subsequently concluded that Angelo's (U.S. Patent 6,581,162) teaching of a "system request" met the limitation of the claimed "condition." (See the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of the Decision). As the Board reiterated its broad construction of "control value" (Decision, first full paragraph on page 9), the Examiner then concluded that the control value was indeed disclosed in the cited prior art as well.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 20 to specifically state that "said condition consisting of a respective one of a domain that said processor is operating in, or (b) a mode that said processor is operating in or (c) a type of said monitoring function"

Applicants also include herewith page 762 from *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* which defines "mode," especially in conjunction with computers, as "a particular functioning arrangement or condition: STATUS <a spacecraft in reentry ~> <a computer operating in parallel ~> ."

The Examiner is believed to be misconstruing the definition of the word "mode" and to be defining this claim term in a manner different from the ordinary dictionary definition of the word (which is consistent with the manner in which the term is used in Applicants' specification

and claims). There is nothing in any definition of "mode" in the computer field that indicates that it can be a "control value" or some other active operating function in a computer. It is simply a designation of a particular "functioning arrangement or condition" of the computer. The Examiner is obligated to construe the term in the manner used in the specification and in the manner which is well known to those of ordinary skill in the computer art, i.e., the attached definition of the term.

The Angelo reference does not disclose a mode. In fact, even if the Examiner's interpretation of the word "mode" were to be utilized, the control value is the SMI of Angelo (as interpreted by the Board, Decision page 8 last full paragraph). The Board held that "one of the 'conditions' taught by Angelo is a system request" and "a system request, . . . , subsequently generates an interrupt (asserts the SMI) and enters the system into SM mode (FF 12)." Thus, in Angelo, the control is an interrupt and an interrupt is clearly not a "mode" that the processor is operating in. No matter how the Examiner construes "mode" in the claims, an interrupt, by its nature, is a request to change the manner in which the processor is operating and not an indication of the "mode."

In view of Applicants' amendments to independent claims 1 and 20 limiting the definition of "condition" to the three specified conditions and in view of the evidence of the common definition of the term "mode" as associated with computers, it is submitted that amended claims 1 and 20 clearly distinguish from the subject matter of the Alverson (U.S. Patent 7,020,767)/Angelo combination.

Beginning on page 2, section 6 of the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-18, 20, 21, 23-36, 38 and 39 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Alverson in view of Angelo. It is noted that the Examiner previously cited large portions of the

Angelo reference as purportedly teaching the claimed subject matter. While both the previous Final Rejection and the present Official Action cite similar portions of the Angelo reference, it is unclear as to whether the Examiner is maintaining his previous interpretation of this reference. It is noted that the Board's construction of the "SMI" in Angelo and its definition of "condition" as being a "system request" is inconsistent with the Examiner's interpretation of the Angelo reference. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is now believed to be completely unsupported by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Decision and reconsideration is requested.

Moreover, because Applicants have limited the independent claims' definition of "condition" to one of the three options specified in the independent claims, the Board's (and the Examiner's previous) extremely broad interpretation of "condition" can no longer apply. Thus, the Board cannot conclude that the term "condition" can no longer be met by the Angelo "system request" because it is neither "(a) a respective one of a domain that said processing is operating in or (b) a mode that said processing is operating in or (c) a type of said monitoring function" In view of the more limited nature of the claim definition of "condition," the Angelo reference and its "system request" will not be judged by the Board upon appeal to meet the narrowed claim limitation.

Should the Examiner contemplate rejecting the amended independent claims 1 and 20 (and claims dependent thereon) in view of the Alverson/Angelo combination, the Examiner is specifically requested to identify where or how he believes the Angelo reference teaches the "condition" as limited by claims 1 and 20. Of course, absent such teaching in Angelo, any further rejection under §103 over the Alverson/Angelo combination would be unsupported, as all claimed elements and claimed interrelationships are not shown in the combination of references, thereby failing to meet the first prong of the test of a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Also in view of this more limited definition of "condition," there is a problem with the Examiner's conclusion that there is some reason for combining Alverson and Angelo in a manner that would disclose the claimed "condition." The Examiner's reasons for combining portions of the Alverson and Angelo reference in order to provide the claimed "condition" are respectfully requested, as without these reasons, the Examiner fails to meet the requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness as imposed by the Supreme Court in the KSR decision.

In view of the above, there is believed no further basis for rejecting claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-18, 20, 21, 23-36, 38 and 39 under 35 USC §103 over the Alverson/Angelo combination and any further rejection thereunder is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9, 10, 19 and 37 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the Alverson/Angelo combination in view of "common art," but there is no "common art" identified or cited by the Examiner. Firstly, inasmuch as claims 9, 10, 19 and 37 depend from either independent claim 1 or independent claim 20, the above comments regarding the Alverson/Angelo combination are herein incorporated by reference.

The Examiner's assertion in section 31 on page 10 of the Official Action is respectfully traversed, i.e., that "saving instruction traces is common in the art" especially in the field of "controlling the monitoring function of a processor" as claimed. Applicants rely upon the requirement in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) Section 2144.03 which states that "if the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position." The Examiner's statement that "Examiner asserts that saving instruction traces is common in the art and can be utilized for many debugging purposes" is respectfully traversed. Applicants request that the Examiner, in accordance with the requirements of the MPEP, "cite a reference in support of his or her position." As noted in the MPEP, in response to

a traversal of an assertion of an assertion, "the data should be stated [by the examiner] as specifically as possible, and the facts <u>must be supported</u>, when called for by the applicant, by <u>an affidavit from the examiner</u>." (emphasis added). It is noted that there is no requirement in the MPEP for Applicants to provide any initial affidavit or declaration traversing the Examiner's "common art" assertion. Accordingly, Applicants require the Examiner to support his belief as to what is disclosed in the "common art" which he now alleges is disclosed in claims 9, 10, 19 and 37.

It is clearly noted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 9, 10, 19 and 37 under the provisions of 35 USC §103 over the Alverson/Angelo combination in view of the uncited "common art" and this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 20 and claims dependent thereon are clearly in condition for allowance over the cited prior art and notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

WATT et al Áppl. No. 10/714,483 October 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYLE P.C.

By:

Stanley C. Spooner

SCS:kmm

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808 Telephone: (703) 816-4000 Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

Enclosure:

Exhibit A, Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary definition of "mode"

762 mob • modern

*mob vi mobbed; mob-bing (1709) 1: to crowd about and attack or annoy (mobbed by autograph hunters before he could enter the theater) 2: to crowd into or around (customers ~ the stores on sale days) mob-cap 'mab-kap, 'n * *mob* (woman's cap) + cap| (1795): a woman's fancy indoor cap made with a high full crown and often tied under the chin

annoy (mobbed by autograph hunters before he could enter the theater)

2: to crowd into or around (customers ~ the stores on sale days)

mob-cap \(\text{mab} \) \(\text{mab} \) \(\text{hund} \) \(\text{mob} \) \(\text{mob}



unsuitable 'mock-hero-ic \,mäk-hi-'rô-ik. ,mök-\ adj (ca. 1711) : ridiculing or burlesquing heroic style. character. or action (a \sim poem) — mock-heroical-ly\,\-i-k(s-)-lê\, adv 'mock-heroic n (1728) : a mock-heroic composition — called also

*mock-heroic n (1728): a mock-heroic composition — called also mock-epic mock-ing-bird \mak-in-bord. mok-\n (1676): a common bird (Mimus polyglottos) esp. of the southern U.S. that is remarkable for its exact imitations of the notes of other birds mock orange n (1731): any of various usu, shrubby plants considered to resemble the orange; esp: PHILADELPHUS mock turtle soup n (1783): a soup made of meat (as calf's head or veal), wine, and spices in imitation of green turtle soup mock-up \mak-up. mok\n (1783): a soup made of meat (as calf's head or veal), wine, and spices in imitation of green turtle soup mock-up \mak-up. mok\n (1920): a full-sized structural model built accurately to scale chiefly for study, testing, or display 'mod \mad \mad (1964): MODERN: esp: bold and free in style, behavior, or dress

| Immod \maid \ adj (1964): MODERN: esp: bold and free in style; behavior, or dress | Immod \ adj (1965): one who wears mod clothes | Immod \ acrylic fiber \ \maid \to \ \maid \to \ \maid \ available \ availabl

modal auxiliary n (ca. 1904): an auxiliary verb (as can, must, might, may) that is characteristically used with a verb of predication and expresses a modal modification and that in English differs formally from other verbs in lacking s and -ing forms modal-ity modal-at-e\ n, pi-ties (1617) 1 a: the quality or state of being modal b: a modal quality or attribute: FORM 2: the classification of logical propositions according to their asserting or denying the possibility, impossibility, contingency or necessity of their content 3: one of the main avenues of sensation (as vision) 4: a usu, physical—therapeutic agency?

being modal b: a modal quality or attribute: FORM 2: the classification of logical propositions according to their asserting or denying the possibility. impossibility. contingency. or necessity of their content 3: one of the main avenues of sensation (as vision) 4: a usu, physical through the possibility in the possibility. It is a content of the possibility in the possibility of the possib

nate) $n \pmod{n}$ (modulator + demodulator) (ca. 1952): a device nat converts signals from one form to a form compatible with another ind of equipment (a \sim for transmitting computer data over telephone need).

lines)

Imoder-ate \mad-(a)-rat\ adj [ME. fr. L moderatus, fr. pp. of moderate to moderate: akin to L modus measure] (15c) 1 a: avoiding extremes of behavior or expression: observing reasonable limits \(\alpha \) a chinker\) b: CALM. TEMPERATE 2 a: tending toward the mean or average amount or dimension b: having average or less than average quality: MEDICKE 3: avoiding extreme political or social measures \((\alpha \) andidate\) 4: limited in scope or effect 5: not expensive: reasonable or low in price 6 of a color: of medium lightness and medium chroma — moder-ately adv — moder-ate-ness n and moder-ate \mad-vmd--rat\) \(\begin{array}{c} \) moder-ate \mad-vmd--rat\) \(\begin{array}{c} \) wb -at-ed; -at-ing \(v \) (15c) 1: to lessen the intensity or extremeness of (the sun moderated the chill) 2: to preside over or act as chairman of \(\sim v \) in 1: to act as a moderator 2: to become less violent, severe, or intense — moder-at-tion \(\) \(\min \) and \(\sim v \) as a moder-ater \(\sim v \) and \(\si

Indertate \'mad-(a-)rat\ n (1794): one who holds moderate views or who belongs to a group favoring a moderate course or program (as in politics or religion) moderate breeze n (ca. 1805): wind having a speed of 13 to 18 miles per hour.

oderate gale n (ca. 1805): wind having a speed of 32 to 38 miles per

der-a-to \,mäd-ə-'rät-(,)ō\ adv or adj [lt. fr. L moderatus] (ca. 1724)

moder-a-to \mad-a-'rât-()\delta\ adv or adj [1t, fr. L moderatus] (ca. 1724):
MODERATE — used as a direction in music to indicate tempo moder-a-tor \mad-a-rât-a-r\ n (1560) 1: one who arbitrates: MEDIA-TOR 2: one who presides over an assembly. meeting, or discussion: as a: the presiding officer of a Presbyterian governing body b: the nonpartisan presiding officer of a town meeting c: the chairman of a discussion group 3: a substance (as graphite) used for slowing down neutrons in a nuclear reactor — mod-er-a-tor-ship \,\ship\ n \mad-mod-er\ \mad-o-ran\ adj [LL modernus, fr. L modo just now, fr. modus measure — more at METE] (1585) 1 a: of, relating to or characteristic of a period extending from a relevant remote past to the present time b: of, relating to or characteristic of the present or the immediate past: CONTEMPORARY 2: involving recent techniques.

mi lar n -mo pri str: Momod pre to the 100 mod izin mo mod mod ing mod-(15 b: ing etie

mod-ate. mod-state ited char mod-mat mat mod-L m um! men end chan mo-di and mod-u mod mod u "ulere where fixed 4 wo

est-i mod-

to pla sure adjus vary wave) the ve with: mean: kevs \-,lāt-. mod-u-. pitch 3: a proces of this mod-ule measu by who 3 a: unit or a singi depen.
vehicle
additic
additic
from ti
= (ab

low a

of m. modu mode